



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,881	06/21/2006	Michio Nishi	CU-4891 RJS	8922
26530 7590 10/19/2010 LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604				
EXAMINER				
CALANDRA, ANTHONY J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1741				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/19/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12-13 are canceled. Claims 7 and 11 have been amended and are currently pending. The examiner entered the amendment because no new matter was entered, no further consideration/search was needed and the amendment simplified the issues for appeal.

Explanation of how amended claims would be rejected

Claims 7 and 11 would be rejected on the same basis as per the final action dated 5/18/2010 pg. 8 #2.

Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-142638 SATORU et al., hereinafter SATORU, in view of U.S. Patent 6,470,898 KAMO, hereinafter KAMO, and Handbook for Pulp and Paper Technologists by SMOOK.

Response to arguments

Applicants argue that neither JP638 (also referred to as SATORU in the final rejection) nor KAMO disclose or suggest the feature “the step of dewatering the paper comprises squeezing and dewatering of the washed paper piece” or “the dewatering device is configured to squeeze and dewater the water-washed paper piece”. The applicant argues that the examiner agreed with this statement in the Final office action dated 5/18/2010.

The examiner agrees with the applicant’s reading of the final rejection and agrees that this feature is not taught by JP638 or KAMO. JP638 and KAMO are combined with SMOOK to obtain this feature.

The applicants argue that the combination of JP638 and KAMO in view of SMOOK fails to meet this claim feature. The applicants argue that “sheet” as disclosed on line 10 and 13 in the right hand column on page 228 of SMOOK do not correspond to the feature the ‘water

washed paper piece' in amended claims. The applicant argues similarly that 'paper pieces' of JP638 and 'paper stock' of KAMO do not correspond to the paper sheet of SMOOK.

The examiner disagrees there is a clear correspondence between paper piece/stock and paper sheet of SMOOK.

In the combination of JP638 and KAMO, as per JP638, a paper piece is removed a gypsum board by crushing the gypsum board and performing heating on the gypsum with the paper piece. The crushed and heated gypsum and paper is then mixed with water and agitated. The act of crushing with agitation/mixing into water breaks the paper piece into fibers dispersed in water (i.e. pulp). The instant specification agrees that the paper pieces can be dispersed into water [pg. 16 lines 30-34]. The separated paper piece which is now part of a pulp can be further washed as per KAMO.

SMOOK discloses the conventional paper making process. The separated paper piece now a dispersed pulp and washed as per KAMO can be further diluted in the headbox. The diluted fiber containing solution is spread over a fourdrinier table with the diluted paper piece partly dewatering and forming part of a wet sheet. The diluted paper piece, now a wet sheet, is then pressed and further dewatered by rollers.

Therefore, the paper piece of JP638 and KAMO is washed and flows through to the pressing/dewatering of SMOOK. While SMOOK may have additional steps the applicant has used the 'comprising' language in the claims which does not limit the claim only to the disclosed steps.

***/Anthony J Calandra/
Examiner, Art Unit 1741***

Application/Control Number: 10/583,881
Art Unit: 1741

Page 4

/Matthew J. Daniels/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1741